

Attachment 2-1, Census Address Summit Agenda
 Thursday, September 8th, 2:00pm Address Maintenance and Sharing
 Small Group Break Out Session Worksheet

Group #: 2	Group Members: Bob Colosi, Donald Dittmar, Jim Wilson, Phil Lutz, Bill Johnson, Rob Surber, John McKay, Barney Krucoff, Maryann Chapin
1. From your experience, what is required to build great partnerships that make address data sharing successful? What are the deal breakers to building great partnerships for this purpose?	
<p>A: Our Experience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners with something to bring to the table • Understanding “What’s in it for me” for each partner • Understanding and recognizing constraints but still being able to work together – despite the constraints • Standards Authority and Board – general purpose not to set up for addressing, but addressing was one of the things they enforced (establishing structure for address Db) • Governance process – rules of engagement • Marketing plan – packaging the story • Communication plan – who communicated and when <p>B: Deal Breakers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People with restrictions that cannot be dealt with • People with unrealistic expectations • Lack of timely performance/accountability • People who “sell” data, won’t play nicely with people who have data sharing agreements and put data out in the public domain • People/groups who wanted to engage in mass mailings that crossed jurisdictional boundaries (systems to systems integration) 	
2. What are the most pressing issues that your respective organizations currently face with address maintenance? Address data sharing?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When dealing with multiple authorities, a business rules engine is needed to bring things together and make things better over time • Governance of address....who has the authority of addressing? Often this is a hidden function: who assigns, how they assign, when it is assigned • Privacy restrictions or interpretation of privacy restrictions. It’s too easy to say “no” so that we don’t have to change. • Having metadata...having situations not “matching” kicked out for further review (ability to 	

deal with getting bad addresses)

- **Lack of full participation...the ones that wont "play ball"**

3. If funding were not a consideration, what would you propose to improve address development in your respective organization(s)?

- **Creation of a template that people can populate regarding how, who, etc, different areas assign addresses and having a repository for this information**
- **Cloud based system that all local governments contributed to, but which the governor could see all the addresses. Offering incentives to local to participate (universally accessible)**
- **X,Y coordinate system of which address is just one attribute of**
- **Address development is done dynamically and operates independently of legacy systems**
- **Use of social media to self-serve when changes occur that you are interested in**